

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

AMERICAN CONSOLIDATED)	
INDUSTRIES, INC., <i>et al.</i> ,)	Case No. 1:19-cv-137
)	
Plaintiffs,)	Judge J. Philip Calabrese
)	
v.)	Magistrate Judge Thomas M. Parker
)	
CHAD BLASINGIM, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
<hr/>		
MONARCH STEEL COMPANY,)	
INC.,)	Case No. 5:17-cv-2253
)	
Plaintiff,)	Judge J. Philip Calabrese
)	
v.)	
)	
JAMES MCCrackEN, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

ORDER

Previously, the Court provisionally permitted the briefs and exhibits related to Defendant’s motion for summary judgment to be filed under seal, to allow time for the parties to agree on proposed redactions. (*Blasingim* ECF No. 264; *McCracken* ECF No. 132.) Plaintiffs propose redactions to their brief in opposition to the motion for summary judgment and propose sealing or redacting parts of the accompanying exhibits (*Blasingim* ECF No. 306-1; *McCracken* ECF No. 143-1.) Separately, Plaintiffs propose redacting sensitive information within Defendant’s reply brief. (*Blasingim* ECF No. 310; *McCracken* ECF No. 146.)

On July 22, 2024, the Special Master filed a report recommending a plan to protect certain information contained in Plaintiffs' brief in opposition to Defendants' motion for summary judgment and accompanying exhibits. (*Blasingim* ECF No. 307; *McCracken* ECF No. 144.) With one exception, the Special Master recommends approving the redactions proposed by Plaintiff and sealing the five exhibits specified. (ECF No. 306-1, PageID #15137–68; *McCracken* ECF No. 143-1, PageID #5507–08.) Defendants do not object. (*Blasingim* ECF No. 307, PageID #15259; *McCracken* ECF No. 144, PageID #5597.)

Additionally, on August 12, 2024, the Special Master submitted a second Report and Recommendation, this time addressing proposed reactions to Defendant's reply in support of the motion for summary judgment. (*Blasingim* ECF No. 309; *McCracken* ECF No. 145.) In line with the Court's prior order, Defendant filed the reply brief under seal provisionally. (*Blasingim* ECF No. 308.) Plaintiff requests redactions to what it considers internal, highly sensitive information, such as names of customers, pricing, sales and revenue information, and contractual terms relating to non-parties. (See *Blasingim* ECF No. 310; *McCracken* ECF No. 146.) Defendant does not object to the redactions proposed by Plaintiffs (*Blasingim* ECF No. 309, PageID #15303; *McCracken* ECF No. 145, PageID #5606), and the Special Master also recommends allowing the proposed redactions. (*Blasingim* ECF No. 309, PageID #15306; *McCracken* ECF No. 145, PageID #5609.)

The Court finds that the parties' interest in protecting the confidential and proprietary information and the alleged trade secrets contained in the proposed

sealed or redacted exhibits outweighs any public interest in access to that information. The Court also finds that the proposed sealing and redactions recommended by the Special Master, as related to both Plaintiff's brief in opposition and its exhibits, and Defendant's reply brief, are narrowly tailored to include only sensitive information. Therefore, the Court **ADOPTS** the Special Master's recommendations (*Blasingim* ECF Nos. 307 & 309; *McCracken* ECF Nos. 144 & 145), and **ORDERS** that action be taken to carry out those recommendations forthwith, and no later than August 26, 2024. Specifically, the parties shall file redacted versions of the briefs and exhibits as recommended.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 13, 2024

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Philip Calabrese', is written above a horizontal line.

J. Philip Calabrese
United States District Judge
Northern District of Ohio